



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY, 1898

GLEANINGS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND GEOGRAPHY.

THE present writer holds that we have to prepare for a thorough revision of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament by devoting continuous work to the many obscure passages. No school of emenders has a right to disparage another; all methods must be tried, must be combined. What is here given is for the most part new: repetition has been avoided. A list is here given of the passages considered.

Lev. xxv. 34.	Isa. xxx. 4, 5.
Judges v. 22, 21.	Jer. ix. 1.
(Deut. vii. 1.)	Hos. vi. 5.
(1 Chron. vi. 57.)	Amos iii. 12.
Judges iv. 11.	Amos vi. 1-5.
Judges iv. 2, 13, 16.	Mic. i. 7.
1 Kings x. 11.	(Isa. i. 31.)
1 Kings xviii. 21.	Mic. i. 10-12.
2 Kings xvii. 6.	Mic. i. 13, 14.
(Zeph. i. 9.)	Mic. v. 3-5.
1 Chron. iv. 17-19.	(Ps. lv. 22.)
(Exod. xxxi. 2; Neh. iii. 6.)	(Job xli. 21.)
Job xxxviii. 36.	Zech. ix. 1.
Cant. ii. 16.	Zech. ix. 13.
Cant. iv. 6, 8.	Zech. ix. 15, 16.
Cant. viii. 14.	Mal. ii. 11.

Geography is only referred to on Isa. xxx. 4, 5 and Mic. i. 10-14.

Lev. xxv. 34. וַיִּזְרְהוּ מִן־גֵּרְשׁ עֲרֵיהֶם. For מִן־גֵּרְשׁ, generally rendered "suburb" (LXX, *προάστειον*) or "common land," but without a plausible etymology (for גֵּרֵשׁ means "to drive away," not "to drive out cattle to pasture"), read מִן־עֲרֵשׁ. וַי and ג confounded, as עֲמֵרָה = *Γόμορρα*. Root עֲרֵשׁ = Ass. אֶרֶשׁ IV. "to plant or till" (see Del. *Ass. H. W. B.*), whence *mērišu* and *mērištu*, "planted, or tilled, land." An uncommon word, מִן־גֵּרְשׁ, is chosen (by the late writers who use it) for the specialized sense of land reserved for the use of the community or (Ezek. xlv. 2) for the sanctuary.

Judges v. 22, 21. Dr. Paul Ruben, in his *Study of the Song of Deborah* (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1898, pp. 541 ff.), has made it clear to me that Kadesh and Hadrach were the two chief foes of Israel at the time referred to in the Song. (Sisera was a Hittite.) Modifying his restoration, which is most brilliant, I would venture to read verses 22 and 21 (for they have to be transposed) in this way. (One word in the third line is Dr. Ruben's suggestion, see below.)

אֹן נִלְחָמוּ קִישׁוֹנִים
קִישׁוֹן נִרְדְּמוּ אֲבִירָיו
צָרַף קִישׁוֹנִי נֶחֱל קִישׁוֹן
צָרַפָּם חֲדָרְכִי בְּפִשִּׁשׁ

אֹן should certainly be נִלְחָמוּ; cf. ver. 19. עֲקֵבִי כֹחַ is a scribe's attempt to make sense out of קִישׁוֹנִים or קִישׁוֹנִים, a name which he did not understand. מִדְּהָרוֹת is certainly נִרְדְּמוֹת or נִרְדְּמוֹת; נ and ד are confounded. Dr. Ruben has already pointed out the Greek reading τὰς ὑβρεὶς ἐκστάσεως αὐτῶν. This is not נִרְדְּמוֹת, but תִּרְדְּמוֹת, which comes from נִרְדְּמוֹת (קִישׁוֹן). In the third line a verb is wanting. Dr. Ruben has (in a letter to me) proposed צָרַף (in the Assyrian sense of "dyed"). The fourth line he has himself fully explained. This has suggested to me two further

explanations of hard problems. Critics have generally supposed that קדש *Kedesh*, in 1 Chron. vi. 57 was an error for the קָשִׁיֹן of Josh. xix. 20, xxi. 28. But really the Chronicler has preserved one letter in the true name which "Joshua" has all but lost. The name is קדשֹן, the Gadašuna of the Amarna Tablets, the Kitsuna of the Name-list of Thotmes III (cf. *Tell Keisān*, as proposed already, south-east of Akka). And the Girgashites (one of the archaeological trifles of the Deuteronomist; see Deut. vii. 1) are simply the Kadasonim or Kedeshim, i. e. the northern or *Hittite* Kadeshites. Whether the name Gershon or Gershom (sometimes given Γεδσων in LXX) also originates in Gadshon or Kadshon, I will not now consider.

Judges iv. 11 contains a statement that the northern limit of the wanderings of Heber the Kenite, and the site of his encampment at the time of the narrative, was "the Tree of Basanim, which was by Kedesh" (so Moore, in his excellent commentary on Judges). The difficulty of the passage is twofold. (1) In Josh. xix. 33 the tree is placed on the border of Naphtali, but if we may interpret our passage in accordance with Judges iv. 17, v. 24, it was much nearer the battle-field, which was by the torrent-stream Kishon. (2) The name cannot be accounted for; it is not likely that it comes from בַּעֲנָה, which in New Hebrew means "ditch, dike, pond" (cf. בָּצָה in Job viii. 11, xl. 21). The old scribes and translators were themselves puzzled by it. It must, I think, be taken in connexion with certain other passages (to be referred to presently), which originally (as it can be shown), contained the name קָדֶשֶׁן or קִדְשֹן, i. e. Kadesh, either Kadesh on the Orontes, or the Kadesh called in the Amarna Tablets Gadashuna. From בַּעֲנָנִים (the form which the best critics prefer—it is the K'tib in Judges iv. 11) to גִּדְשָׁנִים the passage is easy. It is more natural to suppose that the "oak" or "sacred tree" (אֵלֶךְ) referred to was near the Kidshon (Kedesh) of Issachar, than to follow the "priestly writer" in Joshua, who places it on the border of Naphtali. That writer was presumably led

into error by the statements in Judges iv. 6, 9, 10 with reference to the mustering-place of the Israelites.

Judges iv. 2, 13, 16. Marquart (*Fundamente israelit. und jüd. Gesch.*, p. 3) and Ruben (*JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, April, 1898, p. 554) have already pointed out that Sisera, the Hittite king who oppressed certain Israelitish tribes, ought to have resided at Kadesh on the Orontes. I have only to add that here, as in some other passages of the Old Testament, Kadesh appears, I believe, under the form קדשון, Kadshon (Kidshon). The ך at the end of חדשת represents ך, since, as Blau has shown (*Zur Einl. in d. heil. Schr.*), the final forms of letters established themselves very slowly.

1 Kings x. 11 אֶלְמֻגִּים עֵצֵי. The "almug-timber" (or, as 2 Chron. ix. 10 has it, "algum-timber") has usually been identified with sandal-wood, but there are some objections to this view. The LXX in Chron. renders ξύλα πεύκηνα, pine-timber. I think the Hebrew word is an incorrect form of Ass. *elammûku*, a wood of the nature of cypress used by Sennacherib in building his palaces (see the Assyrian dictionaries of Delitzsch and Muss-Arnolt). In this case מֶאֱפִיר will need correction. The tree may have grown in *Senîr* (i. e. Hermon) and Lebanon; cf. 2 Chron. ii. 8. Perhaps the Phœnician and Syrian kings, like the Assyrian, planted foreign trees. This is suggested in case *elammûku* contains the name Elam, and indicates the original home of the tree.

1 Kings xviii. 21. "How long will ye go on עַל-שֵׁתִי פְסָחִים הַפְעֵפִים?" Dr. Toy (*Journ. of Biblical Lit.*, XVI, 78 f.) has shown that פֶּסַח denotes some ritual performance. He also thinks that the old nomadic Hebrew spring festival probably derived its name Pesah (פֶּסַח) from the "leaping" or "dancing" which was the principal ritual ceremony of the year. I think myself, with Dr. Trumbull (*Threshold Covenant*, 1896), that the Pesah derives its name from a threshold ceremony; only, of course, it was not the God of Israel, but the individual Israelite who "leaped" over the threshold, in recognition of its sanctity, into the house

made holy by sacrificial rites. This throws a bright light on the speech of Elijah to the assembled Israelites. הַפְּעִים should, of course, be הַפְּסִים, as Klostermann has already pointed out. But Elijah's question is, not "How long will ye go past the two thresholds?" (undecided at which of the two houses to request hospitality), but "How long will ye leap over both thresholds?" i. e. enter with the same scrupulous awe the sanctuaries of the two rival deities, Yahwè and Baal. Zeph. i. 9, too, now becomes clear. Reading the second part of the verse as in LXX, we should render or paraphrase, "And on that day (the day of Yahwè's sacrifice) I will punish those who, though they leap with scrupulous reverence over the sacred threshold, yet bring with them into Yahwè's house hands stained with cruelty and injustice" (cf. Isa. i. 12, 15; lxi. 8).

2 Kings xvii. 6. יְעָרִי מְרִי (LXX καὶ ὄρη Μηδων); 1 Chron. v. 26 וְהָרָא. Probably in both passages we should read יְבִחְרֵחַר עֵיר מְרִי; out of this all the various readings referred to may have arisen. It is true, "mountains (see LXX, B and A, and cf. Luc.) of Media" is a plausible designation. But the definiteness of the preceding statement justifies the supposition that the original document had some place-name. Now Sargon, who deported the Israelites in the reign of Hoshea, expressly tells us that he colonized Ḥarḥar with captives from other countries ("Khorsabad inscr." 61 f., in *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, II, 60 f.). We also learn from the great list in Ezra ii, Neh. vii, and 1 Esdras v, that the Bne Ḥarḥur (read Ḥarḥar) were among the families of Nethinim in early post-exilic times. That הֲרָחֹר in that list means either "violent heat" or "free birth," as suggested in the new Hebrew Lexicon (BDB), seems hardly a probable view.

1 Chron. iv. 17-19. The romance of the Egyptian princess who entered a Jewish family, and received the name Bithiah (בִּתְיָה "daughter of Jah"; cf. בֵּית יָאֵל נָכָר, Mal. ii. 11), must be abandoned. Bithiah is most probably a corruption of בְּעִלְיָה "Bealiah" (1 Chron. xii. 5). פֶּרַעַה "Pharaoh" (ver. 18) should be פֶּרְעָה; cf. the Ephraimite place-name פֶּרְעָתוֹן,

Judges xii. 15. Mered, the vowels of whose name suggest his "rebelliousness" in marrying an Egyptian wife (cf. Ezra ix. 1, 2), should probably be Maroth (מְרוֹת), or rather Jarmuth (יַרְמוּת), which seems to be the right correction of מְרוֹת in Micah i. 12¹. "Jehudijah" (ver. 18) should certainly be "Hodiah," the name given in ver. 19, where we should as certainly read, not אִשָּׁת, but אִשְׁתִּי. Thus three separate traditions respecting the family of "Mered" have come down to us. In one of them his wife is called Bithiah (rather Bealiah), in another Jehudijah (rather Hodiah), and in a third Hodiah. It is not impossible that Hodiah may have been deliberately substituted for Bealiah²; we may observe that the name Eshtemoa occurs both in the account of Bithiah's family³, and in that of Hodiah's. The edifying story produced by the last editor reminds one of two other names which have become corrupted, and have been converted into instruments of edification. It has not been noticed hitherto, but is none the less certain, that בְּצַלְאֵל "Bezaleel" (Exod. xxxi. 2; Ezra x. 30), usually explained "in the shadow of God," should rather be הַלְצִיאֵל "God rescues," and that בְּסוּדִיָּה "Besodeiah" (Neh. iii. 6), usually interpreted "in God's intimacy" (cf. Job xxix. 4), ought to be corrected to הַפְדִּיָּה (cf. 1 Chron. iii. 20). For the former correction I may cite the Phoenician personal names הַלְצִבְעֵל and אִשְׁמִנְחֵלֶץ.

Job xxxviii. 36. Much speculation exists as to the meaning of טַחֲוֹת and יִצְבִּי. Recent critics have given up the Rabbinical interpretations, and explained the terms conjecturally of sky—or cloud—phenomena. I am sure myself that טַחֲוֹת is (like חוֹתָה in Job xli. 21) a corruption of חֲרָחָה "lance," i. e. Tartāhu, the Babylonian name of the "lance-star" (Tartāhu means "lance"; see on Micah v. 3-5), Antares, whose heliacal rising marks the autumnal equinox

¹ Note that the Jarmuth in Issachar is called יַרְמֹה in Josh. xix. 21.

² Why בְּגִיָּה was not altered in 1 Chron. xii. 5 is not clear.

³ I assume, with most critics, that ver. 18 b should have come between ver. 17 a and ver. 17 b.

(see Jensen, *Kosmologie*, pp. 49 ff., and cf. Lockyer, *Dawn of Astronomy*, p. 358). As for שְׁכִי, I think it is either the Babylonian *mishhu* (with plural ending), which is a name applied to meteors and shooting-stars (Jensen, pp. 155 f.) with reference to their sudden flaring up, or Bab. *mishri* in the phrase *kakkab mishri*, a synonym of Tartahu. Job xxxviii. 36 is therefore a continuation of verses 31, 32. To me this new fact appears extremely interesting. Or perhaps this is a still better suggestion for the correction of שְׁכִי. To correspond to the Lance-star we need the Bow-star. Somewhere in fact Job xxxviii must surely contain a reference to such an important star. Now כ and ק are often confounded; ו may arise out of an imperfect ת. Transposition of letters is common. שְׁכִי therefore may come from קֶשֶׁת. The parallelism then becomes perfect. As Jensen shows, *kakkab kisti* in Babylonian astronomy is Sirius.

Cant. ii. 16 בְּתֵר הָרִי בְּתֵרִים should be בְּרֵתִים (cf. i. 17). Elsewhere the Lebanon mountains are called "mountains of panthers" (iv. 8); here נְמָרִים should probably be בְּרָשִׁים. If so מַעֲנוֹת אֲרִיּוֹת should be גְּבוּעֹת אֲרִיּוֹת (terminations confounded, as not infrequently).

Cant. iv. 6 "The mountains of myrrh," &c. Impossible. For הַפָּר read הַיָּמֶן, and for הַלְבוֹנָה read הַלְבָּנֹן (so LXX).

Cant. viii. 14 "The mountains of spices." For בְּשָׂמִים read בְּרוֹשִׁים "mountains of cypresses." Cf. on ii. 16. The perception of the poet's fondness for spices led the scribes into strange errors.

Isa. xxx. 4, 5. The interpretation given in my recent *Isaiah* (Haupt's Bible), which represents work done several years ago, seems to me now improbable. Recent critics are no doubt all of one mind, but they have not criticized MT. surely enough. I have been lately reconsidering the text, and my first discovery was that "Hanes" ought to be "Tahpanes," as in order (1) to produce a perfect parallelism to "Zoan," and (2) to avoid identifying Hanes either with Hunen-suten or Hunensu (i.e. Heracleopolis), or with a particular place in the Delta, the hieroglyphic name of

which was Khens (see Naville, *Ahnas el-Medineh*, pp. 3, 4). Tahpanes (see Flinders Petrie, *Nebeshek and Defenneh*, p. 47 ff.) was the Greek Daphnae, in the sandy desert bordering on Lake Menzaleh; it was the advanced point to guard the highway into Syria. Hanes occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament, and yet Isaiah must mean a place well known to the Jews. Tahpanes was so in Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's time; it may well have been so in the time of Isaiah. חנס at any rate is wrong; אהנס would be possible (cf. the Coptic name Ahnas = Heracleopolis); but the appearance of verses 4 and 5 both in MT. and in LXX suggests that more than one letter may have fallen out of the text, and that we should, for חנס, read תחפנחס. In ver. 5 neither הביש nor הבאיש can be right, and though Kittel thinks it quite superfluous, the correction כלם הביאן שי (Krochmal, Grätz) seems to me necessary; verses 5 and 6 thus become parallel; also מלאכים and שרים for the forms with יִי (so LXX, ἀρχηγοί, ἄγγελοι); and חנו for היו. I notice too that Grätz already has תחפנחס, which indeed is the reading of the Targum. Thus geography, as well as textual criticism, is the gainer.

Jer. ix. 1. For עֲצֶרֶת בְּנֵי־רָם read חֶבְרֶת ב' (cf. Job xxxiv. 8, and חֶבֶר in Hos. vi. 9). I do not think with Jastrow (*Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, 1898, p. 336) that ע' can have the sense of "band."

Hos. vi. 5. חֲצֹנִי should perhaps be פְּרִצְתִּי. "Therefore have I come with violence on the prophets" (פ' as in Exod. xix. 24). Cf. Hos. iv. 5.

Amos iii. 12. "In such a scanty remnant shall the Israelites be delivered, who sit in Samaria יִבְמִשְׁכָּב בְּצִפְתִּי מִטָּה וְיִבְמִשְׁכָּב מִשְׁכָּב." עֲרֶשׁ מִשְׁכָּב of course means not only the frame of the couch, but all that belongs to it, e. g. cushions (so probably 2 Sam. xvii. 28). צִפִּית only occurs in Isa. xxi. 5, but the sense is not very doubtful. The facts are fully stated in my *Introduction to Isaiah*, p. 126. No other correction of פאת is, I think, possible. בַּפֶּשֶׁב is self-evident, and בְּצִפְתִּי is required as a parallel to it.

"in Gilgal." But this word is too long, and why should Gilgal be mentioned here? Giloh, on the other hand, is a town in the hill country of Judah (*Jála*, north-east of *Kíla*), and the paronomasia produced is perfect. I would remark here that Micah simply puts Giloh first, because "In Giloh rejoice not" fitly introduced his dirge on the Shephelah. עֲבָרָה, omitting the אֵל, is due to Elhorst and Wellhausen. The LXX seems to have had בָּבִים, with one ב, but to have read it נָבִים, and to have taken it as a shortened form of עֲנָקִים "Anakites"; it gives οἱ ἐνακείμ, though Vollers prefers a reading which is also found, οἱ ἐν βακείμ, which seems to me improbable. The LXX connected the Anakites with Gath (cf. 2 Sam. xxi. 20). For בֵּית אֶפְרָה "Beth Aphrah"¹ MT. has בֵּית לְעֶפְרָה. The ל prefixed to עֶפְרָה is simply misplaced; after הַתּ a preposition is required (one would expect הַתּ).² At this point Wellhausen exclaims, "It is hopeless, and also not worth while, to trouble oneself about the sense of the paronomasias." I do not myself at all agree with this. It is worth while, and it is not hopeless for those who have had sufficient practice in the correction of "hopeless" passages. After the Song of Deborah and Psalm xlix, I see no occasion for despair here. "Shaphir," of course, had attached to it a play on the verb שָׁפַר; we have to study the letters of the text, and see if we cannot recover one. At once we notice the initial ע of עֲבָרָה. This letter in MT. is often a mutilated ש, just as ל (the initial letter of לָכֵן) is often a misread ר. Combine the two groups of letters, and we get שְׁבִירָכֵן. Now שְׁבִיר in Aramaic means "sparkling, glittering"; its root is שָׁבַר = שָׁפַר "to glitter, to be beautiful,"

¹ There may be an echo of this name in the Wady el-Ghafr, which runs east, a little to the south of *Merāsh* (Mareshah). Prof. G. A. Smith points out the name (*Twelve Prophets*, I, 384), but he draws no inference, because he mistakenly supposes that "the name ought to be one of a Philistine town." I believe that the names ought to be and are names of Judahite towns.

² הַתּ hardly needs a defence. The second ה in K'tib is due to a scribe, who thought of פְּלִשְׁתָּה "Philistia."

whence שפריר "the beams of the dawn." שפריר, the same word, occurs in Jer. xliii. 10, where it seems to mean the glittering hangings of the royal canopy (G. Hoffmann, *Zeitschr. f. die Alttest. Wissenschaft*, II, 68). עריה בשת is not less wrong than עברו לכם, and is untranslatable. The proposed correction is easy and efficacious. Shaphir, "the glittering," may possibly be that famous tall limestone cliff which commands the entrance of the Wady es-Sant (the Valley of Elah?), and which is now called Tell es-Sâfiyeh, "the shining hill." On its summit are the ruins of the crusading fortress of Blanchegarde; lower down, in order to be nearer a "well of living water," is the modern village; the ancient town, however, seems to have been in the plain, towards the north-east, where there still exists a ruin¹. It is Tell es-Sâfiyeh which Mr. Conder identifies with Gath, and Guérin (*Judée*, II, 90 ff.) with תצפיה "the watch-tower," mentioned in Josh. xv. 38.

"For ever dost thou migrate," is Micah's dirge over Zaanan, which may perhaps have been spelt צענן: the צאנן of MT. may be an error, caused by the corrupt words לא יצאה. "The inhabitants of Zaanan do not go out," seems to me plainly wrong; the paronomasia must have been more effective than MT. represents. Nothing can be made out of the root צאן, but צען at once suggests a striking reflection (cf. Isa. xxxiii. 20, אהל בל-צען) which Micah can hardly fail to have made.—In the next line my chief correction (that which suggests the others) is צעילי. This has reference, not to MT.'s עמרתו (which is plainly corrupt) but to the reading עַצְבְּתִי which underlies the ὀδύνης of LXX. In מָמוֹנִי I come nearer to מָמָם than to LXX.'s alternative reading מַמְבָּת². אַצִּילִים is an old word for "nobles" (Ex. xxiv. 11, LXX ἐπὶ λεκτοί). The next paronomasia is completely obscured in MT. The received text is rendered by Prof. G. A. Smith, "The inhabitress of Maroth trembleth

¹ Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, II, 363.

² LXX has λήμψεται ἐξ ὑμῶν πληγὴν ὀδύνης. 'Εξ ὑμῶν represents מָמָם, and πληγὴν מַמְבָּת (so Wellhausen).

for good, for evil hath come down from Jehovah to the gate of Jerusalem." Clearly "trembleth" must be wrong. Wellhausen emends חָלָה into יַחְלָה "waits." But even then one is dissatisfied, for to produce the expected paronomasia מָר instead of רָע ought to follow in the next clause. Wellhausen himself remarks on the "wundersamer Gegensatz" of the text. The clue to the passage was first found by Houbigant, but it has been lost ever since his time. He would read חלה למות "quia aegra (?) est ad mortem," which he supposes to give the reason why Beth-ezel, or Jerusalem, will be unable to assist Shaphir; it will itself be "sick unto death." He does not, however, account for מרות מרות, and evidently ought to read חלתה. The correction of מות טוב into מות is brilliant, and at once suggested to me that מרות must be corrected into יַרְמוּת, i. e. the ancient city of Jarmuth in the Shephelah of Judah, now represented by a mass of ruins called Khirbet el-Yarmuk, about nine miles north of *Merāsh* (Mareshah), and therefore a place of much interest to Micah. Subsequently to making this study I consulted Grätz's *Emendationes*, and found that I had been anticipated so far as יַרְמוּת is concerned by that brilliant scholar. The whole passage is now beautifully clear, as clear as I hope the paronomasia on Lachish will presently become. שַׁעַר "gate" should of course be שַׁעֲרֵי "gates" (so LXX, Wellh.). The name of Jerusalem escapes being played upon. At least, there is no antithetic word-play like the Uriel-Arial ("city of God"—"altar hearth") of Isa. xxix. 1, 2. But the prophet no doubt takes pleasure in the assonance *sha'aré Yerushalaïm*.

Mic. i. 13, 14:—

צִמְדֵי מְרֻבָּה וְרָכִים יִשָּׁבֵת לְבִישׁ . . . Make ready chariot and trap-
pings, O community of
Lachish . . .

לָכֵן תִּתְּנִי שְׁלֹחִים לְמֹרָשָׁה בַת־צִיּוֹן Therefore shalt thou give a
parting-present to Mora-
shah, O community of Zion;

בֵּית אַחֲזִיב לְאֶחָב לְמֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל : Beth-Achzib has become a de-
ceptive stream for the king
of Israel.

עַרְמָאֲרֵשׁ אֲבִיָּךְ יוֹשֶׁבֶת מַרְשָׁה To a (new) betrother will I
conduct thee, O community
of Mareshah ;

עַרְעוּלִים יֹאבֵד בְּבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל : For ever shall the nobility
of Israel perish.

I am here concerned chiefly with the correction of the text, and with geography : archaeology has at present only a secondary interest. I need not therefore discuss the question how Lachish became the prime occasion of sin to Jerusalem. My own opinion is that some heathen Philistine rites had been introduced first at Lachish, and were then adopted by a certain party at Jerusalem. It probably had nothing to do with the horses and chariots of the sun (2 Kings xxiii. 11) ; the "chariot" is simply suggested by the assonance of *rakis* and *Lakish* (see below).

Now to the text. In ver. 13 רָחַם has no justifiable meaning ; "bind" would be רָחַק, but whether this word would be used of a chariot is doubtful. לָרֶכֶשׁ "to the steed" produces (if we accept the sense "bind") a ὕστερον πρότερον. LXX has ψόφος ἀρμάτων καὶ ἰππευσόντων, i. e. הָפֶר' וְרֶכֶב (or רָעַם ?) הָמֶזֶן. Ruben (*Critical Remarks*, p. 22) partly follows this, but לְהָכִישׁ can hardly mean "shall grow *dumb*." I seem to myself to have found the key in Assyrian. *Samādu* (צִמֵּר) is "to bind," *anspannen*, used of a chariot ; *narkabâte rakîsu*, properly "chariot (and) harness," also "chariot-horses," is a common Assyrian phrase (Delitzsch, *Ass. H. W. B.*, 570, 622). The verb רָכַם is good biblical Hebrew (Exod. xxviii. 28 ; xxxix. 21), and I suppose that a noun רָכִים may well have existed. It suited Micah's purpose to use this (possibly) uncommon word to produce a paronomasia. It may also be that Micah explained לְהָאָכִישׁ as if לְהָאָכִישׁ "to rush forward" (cf. *Ass. akašu*) ; this may even have suggested the figure of the chariot. צִמֵּר "to bind" is classical ; cf. 2 Sam. xx. 8. LXX favours reading כ in the second rather

than in the third place in the opening word of ver. 13. The corruptions ג and ה (for צ) are not impossible in some of the forms of the alphabet which preceded the square characters. The feminine form צמרי is absolutely required; the article prefixed to מ' must be a late insertion. In ver. 14 "Moresheth-Gath" is a quite impossible name for a Judahite town. Feeling this, Wellhausen would interpret גת as a vocative ("O Gath"), and Nowack, with some hesitation, follows him. But what business has the Philistine city of Gath in such a context? Surely we must read בְּתִצִּיִן. After צ' had fallen out, it was natural (especially if גת had already penetrated into ver. 10) to misread בת as גת. The correction here proposed produces an excellent connexion with the preceding verse. "Lachish has been the prime occasion of sin to the 'daughter Zion.' Therefore shalt thou bid farewell (and the parting-present proper for a bride) to Morashah."

The reader will notice that I have passed over the second part of ver. 14—that relating to Achzib. I now repair my omission. MT. has בְּתֵי אַחְזִיב and מְלִכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. In both cases the plural is troublesome; the omission of a י involves no great audacity. The name Beth-Achzib suggests the sombre witticism that the place so called has become a *nahal akzáb*, i. e. is as untrustworthy as a torrent which dries up in the heat of summer (Jer. xv. 18). The king of Israel (i. e. Judah) must not rely on the feeble fortifications of Beth-Achzib to check the Assyrians. Beth-Achzib is mentioned again (without the Beth) in Josh. xv. 44, where it stands between Keilah (Kîla) and Mareshah (Merāsh). I doubt whether this can be 'Ain Kezbeh, at Bêt Nettîf (Netophah), as Prof. G. A. Smith and others suppose; the situation does not sufficiently agree with the indications of our texts. If ver. 14 b could be substituted for ver. 12 b all would be right. But I hesitate to take this bold step, and think that there must have been an Achzib in the district between Keilah and Mareshah, of which no trace is known to exist.

But where is Morashah (or, as MT. gives the name,

Moresbeth)? This is a more difficult question. I believe that it can be proved to be identical with the Mareshah mentioned just afterwards. We hear in ver. 15 of the "new betrother," who, on a fatal battlefield, will destroy the nobility of Israel. Since the same figure is used in ver. 14 with reference to Morashah or Moresbeth, I conclude that Mareshah (spell in Joshua מֶרֶשָׁה) is the same as Morashah. The form Morashah (MT. Moresbeth) is adopted to suggest the meaning "betrothed" (מְאָרְשָׁה), corresponding to מְאָרֵשׁ "betrother," the word corrupted in MT. into הַיֹּרֵשׁ. Part of this explanation I have already given in the *Expositor* (1897, II, 368); I repeat it here in order to explain and justify my new explanation of ver. 13.

All that can be said for the view which distinguishes Micah's Moresbeth or, as tradition gives the name, Moresbeth-Gath from Mareshah has been well said by Robertson-Smith in the article "Micah" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (first footnote). He thinks that the vague testimony of Eusebius (*Onom.* 282, 14) and the more definite statements of Jerome (Ep. cviii, addressed to Paula) prove the point. He admits indeed that Jerome wrote after the pretended miraculous discovery of the relics of Micah in 285 A. D., but thinks that the name of the village which then existed (*Praef. in Mich.*) can hardly have been part of a pious fraud. But obviously all that these statements can prove is the existence, in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, of a village near Eleutheropolis with a name which was given to them in some form which suggested Morasthi (!). And I think that Robinson enables us to clear this matter up. In his *Biblical Researches* (II, 123) he expresses the opinion that Moresbeth-Gath must have been different from Mareshah on account of the difference between מִוֶּרֶשׁ and מֶרֶשָׁה, and because Micah mentions the names together. These arguments indeed are worthless. The pronunciation Mareshah is simply adopted (for clearly it *was* adopted) by Micah to produce the paronomasia in v. 15, and the combination of the names simply means that Micah wished to

connect two paronomasias with the name of his native town. But Robinson adds a very valuable suggestion. The church which covered the site of the supposed sepulchre of Micah is "not improbably" the church, twenty minutes S.S.E. of Bêt Jibrîn (Eleutheropolis), the ruins of which still exist, and are called Sanda Hanna or St. Anne (cf. Gautier, *Souvenir de Terre Sainte*, 1898, p. 63). "Close by," he says, "are the ruined foundations of a village which may or may not be ancient." If this village was ancient, it belonged at any rate to Mareshah (now called Merāsh, about twenty minutes straight to the south of Bêt Jibrîn), and bore its name; if early Christian, it may have been called Morasthi (or something a little like it) to please pilgrims. I shall think this discussion not fruitless, if it should lead scholars to revise an opinion taken up on very insufficient grounds. The investigation of the text of Mic. i. 10-16 has led me to the strong conviction that the view of the Targums on Micah and on Jeremiah is correct. The two names Moresheth and Mareshah belong to one place, viz. Mareshah (Morashah?), and it was of this important place that the prophet Micah was a native.

Mic. v. 3-5. This is a description of the greatness of the Messianic king. It contains several difficulties, which it simply requires a firm and practised hand to remove. Prof. G. A. Smith renders thus, "And he shall stand and shepherd his flock in the strength of Jehovah, in the pride of the name of his God. And they shall abide! For now is he great to the ends of the earth. And such an one shall be our peace . . . And they shall shepherd Asshur with a sword, and Nimrod's land with her own bare blades." Can this possibly be right? "And such an one shall be our peace." The correction seems to me pretty plain. וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא should be וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹמִי "And it shall happen on that day . . ." בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא has dropped out of the text, and שְׁלוֹמִי is an intruder. But where is Shālōm's home? Wait a moment. "And they shall abide." Can this be right? Nowack boldly renders "und sie werden ruhig wohnen."

Transfer שלום from ver. 4 to ver. 3, so as to stand after וישבו, and the enigmatical statement "they shall abide" receives its solution. "They shall abide in peace" ('ש as Isa. xli. 3). Lastly, "her own bare blades" (pointing בפתחיה) is very odd. The critics compare Ps. lv. 22, where פתחות is thought to mean "drawn swords." It is all an imagination. The right reading is בתותחים, or rather בתרתחים "with javelins," and in Ps. *l. c.* תרתחים. תותח = תרתח has already been recognized as an Assyrian word by Barth and Budde in Job xli. 21. It means, not *Keule* (club), as Budde renders in Job, but "lance" (Jensen), or better "javelin" (Delitzsch). See above on Job xxxviii. 36.

Zech. ix. 1. Insert שלח between דבר and יהוה (on Isa. ix. 7), and, with Ball, read עין אֶרֶם for עַם אֶרֶם. Both corrections are indispensable; as the harshness of the current translations shows.

Zech. ix. 13. "I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece (Heb. Javan)," is the rendering of the Revised Version. Nowack and G. A. Smith smooth the passage by changing the second בניך into בני (so LXX, Pesh.). The former scholar speaks strongly against those who would alter יון (read Yāvān), in order to avoid assigning the prophecy to the Greek period. For my own part I believe the prophecy to be of the Greek period, but I am confident that יון is wrong. It is so extremely probable that the scribe who had just written בניך ציין would write the same phrase over again when his eye fell on . . . בני just afterwards that when I see in MT. בניך יון I cannot help thinking that this comes out of בניך ציין (written a second time). It is quite true that the corrections hitherto proposed (see Nowack's note) are wrong. Nothing but close study of the prophecy will enable us to recover the right word. That word is אֶרֶם. In x. 11 the judgment is said to fall upon Assyria and Egypt, but ver. 1 tells us that it will fall on Aram. Reggio (ap. Herzfeld, *Gesch.*) had before me proposed ציין for יון.

Zech. ix. 15, 16. A very pretty correction has to be made, for which Wellhausen has prepared the way. Prof. G. A.

Smith renders "Jehovah will protect them, and they shall devour (?) and trample . . . and they shall drink their blood like wine." I omit some words, and then quote again from the Scottish critic. "And Jehovah their God will give them victory in that day." This is ver. 16, after which the translator comes to a standstill. In a note he says, "Heb. like a flock of sheep his people [but how is one to construe this with the context ?] for (? like) stones of a diadem lifting themselves up (? shimmering) over his land." He adds that a good sense is produced by deleting "for stones . . . shimmering" as a gloss. My own rendering of what I believe to be the true text is as follows: "Yahwè Šēbāōth will protect them as with consecrated stones, and they will eat their flesh (i. e. that of the foes), and will drink their blood like wine." Then, in ver. 16, I continue, "Indeed, Yahwè their God helps them on that day; like a flock will he tend his people on their land." I am sure that וּכְבֹּשׁוּ (and they will subdue) should be בְּשָׂרָם; that וְהָמוּ should be וְרָכָם, others have pointed out. But this is not the chief thing. Wellhausen has seen that מִתְנוּסוֹת have no place in ver. 16. But he has not seen where the home of the words is; they are certainly not a misplaced gloss. They belong to ver. 15. That verse, as given in MT., contains the puzzling words (following כִּבְשׁוּ) אֲבִי-קֶלַע (stones of a sling." Keil supposes this to be a description of the foes, who may be called "slinging stones," because they are to be trodden under foot! Clearly אֲבִי-קֶלַע is a corruption of אֲבִי-קֶדֶשׁ "consecrated stones," and this is a variant of אֲבִי-יְיָ (on which see Wellhausen, *Reste des arab. Heidenthums*, ed. 1, p. 118). We may read either אֲבִי-קֶדֶשׁ or אֲבִי-יְיָ; the sense is the same. It is a strange but a perfectly possible figure. Superstition was still prevalent, and the post-exilic writer says that Yahwè will as it were put a charm upon his people so that no evil can happen to them. The words ought to follow יְיָ. The last verse of the chapter has been ably corrected by Ruben.

Mal. ii. 11. Prof. G. A. Smith renders, "Judah was

faithless, and abomination was practised in Israel and in Jerusalem, for Judah hath defiled the sanctuary of Jehovah which was dear to him, and hath married the daughter of a strange god." No note is added, but the statement that "Judah has married the daughter of a strange god" is not clear. Wellhausen, Marti, and Nowack glide over the difficulty by rendering בָּת "daughters." Dr. Torrey (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, XVII, 9) has recently criticized this, and with justice. He is of opinion that there is no reference in the passage to the marriages between Jews and foreign women denounced by Ezra, but that the prophet makes an application of the old figure of the marriage between a country or people and its God. His argument is skilfully worked out, but does not appear to me to do justice to all the exegetical phenomena. The one point that I see to be in his favour is this passage. I am of opinion that if the other phenomena are adverse to Dr. Torrey's view, as I think that they are, we are justified in touching the by no means immaculate text. For יהודה therefore read אִישׁ יְהוּדָה, and render, "for the men of Judah have defiled the sanctuary of Yahwè which he loves, and have married daughters of foreign gods." אִישׁ יְהוּדָה is frequently used as a collective; if so used here, it gives us a right to interpret בָּת and, if we like, אֱל as collectives too. The "sanctuary" means the sacred land of Canaan (cf. Mal. i. 2, 3), upon which Yahwè requires to see a "sacred seed."

T. K. CHEYNE.